

1  
2  
3  
4  
5                   **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
6                   **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**  
7

8 WILLIAM MISIEWICZ,

9                   *Plaintiff,*

10 vs.

11 STATE OF NEVADA, *et al.*

12                   *Defendants.*

2:13-cv-01419-MMD-VCF

13                   **ORDER**

14                   IT IS ORDERED that defendants' motion (#32) to screen the amended complaint and  
15 motion (#33) to extend their time to answer both are DENIED as unnecessary. The Court  
16 does not need, or want, prompting by motion to screen matters that it screens as a matter of  
17 course. Nor do defendants need an extension of time to answer in this type of case prior to  
18 an express directive that they do so. Counsel might consider in future instead filing a motion  
19 to withdraw an answer as improvidently filed in the circumstance presented by their  
20 inadvertent answer on May 14, 2014. The Court will disregard the answer and will screen the  
21 amended complaint as promptly as its docket allows.

22                   DATED: June 3, 2014

23  
24                     
25

26                   CAM FERENBACH  
27                   United States Magistrate Judge  
28